HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

Writ Petition No.118/2006

CORAM: Hon'ble Shri **S.R.Nayak**, Chief Justice &
Hon'ble Shri **D.R.Deshmukh**, J.

Petitioner	:	Shrichand Sahu, Vice President, Nagar Panchayat, Lawon, Block-Baloda Bazar, Distt. Raipur (CG)
		Versus
Respondents	:	1. State of C.G. through Secretary, School Education Deptt., D.K.S. Bhawan, Raipur (C.G.)
	:	2. Collector, Raipur (CG)
	:	3. Chief Executive Officer, Janpad Panchayat, Baloda Bazar, Raipur (CG)
	:	4. Chief Municipal Officer, Nagar Panchayat, Lawon, Block-Baloda Bazar, Dist. Raipur (CG)

Shri Prashant Mishra, Addl. Advocate General with Shri Utkarsh Verma, Dy. G.A. for the State/respondents No.1 & 2.

Shri Sumit Verma, Counsel for respondents No.3 & 4.

ORAL ORDER
(Passed on 8.2.2006)

The following oral order of the Court was passed by S.R.NAYAK, C.J.

In the letter dated 21.12.2005 of Shri Shrichand Sahu, Vice President, Nagar Panchayat, Lawon, Raipur addressed to the Chief Justice of this Court, it was alleged that the students of Alternative & Innovative Education Center, Lawan, Baloda Bazar are not served with mid-day meal. Treating the above letter above as writ petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, notice has been ordered. In response to notice, respondents No.3 & 4 who were entrusted with providing mid-day meal to the students of that Education Centers, have filed their return. In the return filed by

respondent No.4, it is stated that the benefit of the mid-day meal scheme was extended to the students of the above Education Center only w.e.f. 28.01.2006.

2. In the course of hearing, learned counsel appearing for respondents No.3 & 4 told us that promptly the mid-day meal has been provided to the students of that Education Center w.e.f. 28.01.2006.

3. In view of what is stated in the return of respondent No.3 and the above submission of the learned counsel for the respondents No.3 & 4, we think that there is no need to take any further steps in this case. Accordingly, this writ petition is disposed of subject to what is stated in the return of third respondent and submission made on behalf of respondents No.3 & 4 by their counsel noted above.

Sd/-
Chief Justice

Sd/-
Dilip Raosaheb Deshmukh
Judge